100 mm
A5
1.0
1.1
1.25
1.4
1.6
1.8
2.0
2.2
2.5
2.8
3.2
3.6
4.0
ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ
abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz1234567890
ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ
abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz
1234567890
1.0 mm
1.5 mm
2.0 mm

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 312 947 HE 023 004

TITLE	State Budget Priorities of the Commission, 1989. Commission Report 89-7.
INSTITUTION	California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	Mar 89
NOTE	15p.
AVAILABLE FROM	California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth St., Sacramento, CA 95814-3985.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Basic Skills; *Budgets; Capital Outlay (for Fixed Assets); Community Colleges; Educational Change; English (Second Language); Enrollment Trends; *Higher Education; Public Colleges; *Public Policy; *Resource Allocation; *Statewide Planning; Student Costs; Student Financial Aid
IDENTIFIERS	*California; Cost Containment

ABSTRACT

The California Postsecondary Education Commission adopted the following six priorities for the state budget for higher education during fiscal year 1989-90: (1) expanding funding for adult education programs in English as a second language and basic skills; (2) supporting enrollment growth in California's public universities; (3) implementing community college reforms mandated in recent state legislation; (4) expanding student financial assistance; (5) maintaining low fees for students in public higher education; and (6) funding capital outlay for needed construction, renovation, and repairs. These six priorities are based on existing Commission policy. For each priority, the issue, its context and conditions, and a specific recommendation are outlined. The recommended staff actions involve working with the Legislature, state Department of Finance, and the legislative analyst's office to secure adequate funding for all six priority areas. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CA Postsecondary Education Commission

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Summary

The California Postsecondary Education Commission has adopted the following six priorities for the State budget for higher education during fiscal year 1989-90:

		Page
1.	Expanding funding for adult education programs in English as a second language and basic skills	1
2.	Supporting enrollment growth in California's public universities	2
3.	Implementing the community college reforms of Assembly Bill 1725	3
4.	Expanding student financial assistance	3
5.	Maintaining low fees for students in public higher education	4
6.	Funding capital outlay	5

These six priorities are based on existing Commission policy. The recommended staff actions involve working with the Legislature, the Department of Finance, and the Legislative Analyst's Office to secure adequate funding for all six priority areas.

The Commission approved this report at its meeting on March 6, 1989, on recommendation of its Administration and Liaison Committee. Additional copies of the report may be obtained from the Library of the Commission at (916) 322-8031. Questions about the substance of the report may be directed to Bruce Hamlett of the staff at (916) 322-8010.

STATE BUDGET PRIORITIES OF THE COMMISSION, 1989

A Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
Third Floor • 1020 Twelfth Street • Sacramento, California 95814-3985

COMMISSION REPORT 89-7
PUBLISHED MARCH 1989

This report, like other publications of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 89-7 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

Contents

1. Expanding Funding for Adult Education Programs in English as a Second Language and Basic Skills 1

2. Supporting Enrollment Growth in California's Public Universities 2

3. Implementing the Community College Reforms of Assembly Bill 1725 3

4. Expanding Student Financial Assistance 3

5. Maintaining Low Fees for Students in Public Higher Education 4

6. Funding Capital Outlay 5

References 6

Displays

1. Percentage Increase in Student Fees, 1985-86 Through 1989-90 4

2. Total State and Local Capital Outlay Expenditures (Excluding Federal and Non-State Funds) at the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges, 1976-77 to 1987-88, and Total Need Estimated by the Segments, 1988-89 to 1999-2000 (Dollars in Millions) 5

State Budget Priorities of the Commission, 1989

HISTORICALLY, the Commission's general priorities for the annual postsecondary education budget of the State of California have been to (1) maintain and promote quality in higher education, (2) expand access to higher education for all individuals with the appropriate motivation and ability, and (3) encourage effective intersegmental programs designed to assist students in moving through the educational system to the attainment of their objectives.

The Commission's efforts to expand access to all eligible students have included support for sufficient enrollment capacity in the University of California, the California State University, and the community colleges, adequate financial assistance for needy and able students, and effective programs to increase both the number and academic achievement of students from backgrounds that are historically underrepresented in higher education.

Other factors that the Commission has supported to promote quality and access have included competitive faculty salaries, services for disabled students, and efforts to diversify the faculty, staff and student populations to reflect the changing population profile of the State. Such relatively new issues as long-range planning for educational programs and facilities, and the implementation of reforms in the California Community Colleges such as proposed in AB 1725 have also been priorities.

The Commission anticipates that its priorities during 1989 may have to be more on retaining current levels of enrollments, programs, and services than on encouraging new initiatives for two major reasons -- the shortfall in State revenues and the passage of Proposition 98, with its as-yet undetermined funding effects. During the past three years, the State's budgets have contained small amounts of money for new programs recommended by the Intersegmental Budget Task Force, and many worthwhile programs are now in operation as a result of work by that task force. Yet the likelihood of any such new programs being funded this year is slim. The Commission nonetheless emphasizes that it supports this intersegmental framework and views it as the best forum for the development of pilot programs to achieve the State's educational goals from kindergarten through graduate school.

The Commission presents the following five proposals as its priorities during the upcoming deliberations on the 1989-90 State budget. These priorities reflect the importance the Commission places on not losing ground in areas the State has made a commitment to over the years, and on progressing toward the goals recommended in various reports by the Commission.

---

1. Expanding funding for adult education programs in English as a second language and basic skills

The issue: The urgent need of new immigrants for basic skills instruction is a particular concern of the Commission and one that in its opinion requires immediate action by the Governor and the Legislature. Under the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA), eligible legalized aliens wishing to become citizens have only two and one-half years to show language proficiency. Federal funds to expand citizenship and English as a second language classes for these purposes are available, but their utilization is restricted because of the State-imposed caps on adult education.

The Commission has contracted with California Tomorrow to prepare an assessment of the adequacy of educational services for eligible legalized aliens seeking to gain permanent residency status in California. The major conclusions of the preliminary report prepared by California Tomorrow are:

1. Within California, 1.1 million eligible legalized aliens are likely to avail themselves of the educational services within the next two years.
2. A $64 million shortfall exists in funding educational services for the 1988-89 fiscal year.

3. The English language ability of the eligible legalized aliens is lower than was initially believed. The great majority of these individuals taking courses in English as a second language are enrolled in pre-literacy courses, or their first and most elemental levels.

4. Over a three-year period, the currently funded provider system should be able to provide sufficient places for all eligible legalized aliens. However, an imbalance exists between the location of the providers and the individuals needing services. Insufficient courses are available to ensure access in 46 counties, and 18 counties have significant shortfalls, including Orange, San Bernardino, Fresno, and Santa Barbara.

5. Sixty-eight percent of the community-based organizations, 50 percent of the community colleges, and 53 percent of the adult education programs have waiting lists.

In a recent report, *Meeting California's Adult Education Needs*, the Commission highlighted the need to remove the cap set in current law on funding for courses in English as a second language and basic skills. Currently average-daily-attendance funding generated by adult education is capped, which has the effect of discouraging K-12 schools from enrolling as many adults as might need continued educational services in basic level skills, such as speaking English, learning social studies, and doing the basic mathematics computations needed in day-to-day life.

The Governor's Budget for 1989-90 includes augmentations of $20 million in federal funds in the current year to provide services under the State Legalization Impact Assistant program, and $5.9 million in State funds for a 2.5 percent growth in average daily attendance in adult education programs, with a designated share of that funding to be used for extraordinary needs in adult programs in English as a second language and in elementary and high school basic skills. The Superintendent of Public Instruction would have the responsibility to identify those districts with extraordinary needs. These two proposed augmentations will respond to approximately one-third of the existing unmet need for English as a second language and basic skills adult education.

Recommendation: Commission staff should place a high budget priority on securing funding to provide the needed expansion in ESL and basic skills courses offered through adult education and the community colleges for both eligible legalized aliens and California citizens during the 1988-89 and the 1989-90 budget years.

---

2. Supporting enrollment growth in California's public universities

The issue: California has historically provided all high school graduates and community college transfer students who meet the eligibility criteria for admission to either the University of California or the California State University the opportunity to enroll in that institution. The Governor's proposed 1989-90 budget would allocate $17.8 million to the University of California to fund more than 3,200 additional full-time-equivalent undergraduate students and $4.5 million for 900 new full-time-equivalent graduate students. The proposed budget also would allocate $21.4 million to the California State University for an expected enrollment increase of 6,331 full-time-equivalent students. These enrollment numbers represent percentage increases of 2.8 percent and 2.4 percent, respectively, for each segment and will assure a reasonable choice for qualified students seeking to attend either system.

While the Governor's proposed 1989-90 budget does provide funding for the expected enrollment growth, it has also made significant cuts in the base budgets of the two institutions. The proposed budget does not restore the $33 million and $30 million unallocated budget reductions experienced by the University and the State University, respectively, in the current budget year. In addition, it also provides a $8.3 million reduction in the State University budget for 1989-90, to be accounted for "through increased operating efficiencies." Continued reductions in the base budgets of the public universities will have a long-run negative impact on the general quality of their academic programs and on their capacity to provide access to public baccalaureate education.

Recommendation: Commission staff should place a high priority on working with the Department of Finance, the Legislative Analyst's Office, and the legislative budget committees to support full funding of both enrollment growth

and the base budgets in the University and State University.

---

3. Implementing the community college reforms of Assembly Bill 1725

The issue: Community college reform has several dimensions, including funding for more full-time instructors, more funds for counseling and assessment, a strengthened transfer program, more authority for the Board of Governors in the budget development and negotiation process, more support for faculty development, and better measures of standard costs. The Commission has strongly supported the development and full funding of the community college matriculation program, and the establishment of a Management Information System (MIS) throughout the community college system. With MIS, individual colleges and the Chancellor's Office will be better able to monitor the effects of programs and services on students, strengthen the accountability process, and thereby improve the quality of their educational programs. The costs of total implementation of this and the other reforms recommended in AB 1725 are substantial, but it is possible that the passage of Proposition 98 provides some additional monies that might be used for these purposes.

In addition, the Commission, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the recent Commission for the Review of the Master Plan joined together in calling for a move away from the average-daily-attendance-driven funding system for the community colleges. Under this system, revenues for each district are generated by a rigid State formula -- one based almost wholly on enrollments and adjusted annually by factors that do not relate directly to the revenue needs of the districts. At the same time, most spending decisions are made by local boards of trustees that receive funds appropriated through a budget process based on a statutory formula where the specific consequences of funding levels are not apparent to State officials. This stands in sharp contrast to the State's two public universities, which have some generally agreed-to standards about adequate funding for most of their operations. A broadly based Task Force on Community College Financing, established by AB 3409 and endorsed by AB 1725, has recommended program-based funding for the community colleges. This would divide their appropriations into five categories and apply funding standards to each category -- an approach similar to the two universities. Implementation of this new funding system for the community colleges remains a high Commission priority.

The Governor's Budget proposes $6.5 million for implementation of AB 1725. This proposal includes $5 million for staff development, $1.3 million for affirmative action programs, and $200,000 for instructional improvement programs. The proposed budget also includes $6.8 million for continued development and initial implementation of the Statewide Management Information System. The Chancellor's Office of the Community Colleges requested $70 million for the first phase implementation of AB 1725 reforms.

Recommendation: Commission staff should place a high priority in supporting increases in funding necessary for the implementation of community college reforms. In addition, staff should work closely with State budget officials to implement the change from ADA to program-based funding developed by the AB 3409 Task Force on Community College Finance.

---

4. Expanding student financial assistance

The issue: Between 1980-81 and 1988-89, the cost of attending college in California increased more rapidly than the rate of inflation, faster than the rate of growth in faculty incomes, and much faster than the rate of increase in State and federal student grant aid. Information provided by the California Student Aid Commission indicates that tuition and required fees increased by 267 percent ($593 to $815) at the State University; by 101 percent (from $775 to $1,545) at the University, and by 109 percent (from $5,060 to $9,695) at eligible independent institutions. During this same period, the California Consumer Price Index rose by 44 percent, and the median family income of families whose head was old enough to have children in college rose by approximately 62 percent.

A high priority for the Commission is recognizing the erosion of student financial aid opportunity and addressing this deficit to maintain the State's commitment to access. The Cal Grant A program is a scholarship program for needy and academically talented students that covers their tuition and fees. The Cal Grant B program assists low-income disadvantaged students to attain a baccalaureate degree by covering subsistence costs in their freshman year and tuition, fees and subsistence costs for their remaining three years of college.

Two fundamental problems are eroding the ability of the Cal Grant programs to help the State meet its goals for postsecondary education -- the insufficient size of the Cal Grant awards for students attending independent and public institutions, and the inadequate number of new awards, particularly Cal Grant B. In 1980-81, the $3,200 maximum Cal Grant A award for recipients attending independent institutions covered 63 percent of the $5,060 average tuition at those institutions. By 1988-89, the maximum Cal Grant A award had increased to $4,710, but the coverage of the $9,677 tuition and fees at independent institutions had dropped to 48 percent. Despite 1,500 additional new Cal Grant B awards in 1988-89, the 10,750 awards now available were still insufficient to respond to applications from 34,578 eligible low-income Californians hoping to utilize a grant to attend college.

The Governor's Budget proposes funding to maintain the current-year level and number of both Cal Grant A and B awards. However, no augmentation is proposed to increase either the number of awards or the size of the maximum award.

The Commission places a high priority on expanding financial assistance for low-income students and recommends a balanced approach to expanding both the number and size of the maximum awards.

Recommendation: Commission staff should continue its work to secure additional funding for student financial assistance, through a balanced approach that expands the number of Cal Grant B awards, increases the size of the maximum award for individuals choosing to attend independent institutions, and provides full-fee funding for grant recipients choosing to attend public universities.

5. Maintaining low fees for students in public higher education

A low-price "tuition free" public higher education has long been an essential component of California's Master Plan for Higher Education, as a way both to make college accessible to as many people as possible and to provide a trained workforce for the State's economy. In 1984, through the passage of SB 195 (Maddy), the State adopted the following policy objectives for the public universities:

1. The State shall bear primary responsibility for the cost of providing postsecondary education and thereby keep fees as low as possible;
2. Students shall be responsible for a portion of the total cost of their education; and
3. Any necessary increases in mandatory systemwide student fees shall be gradual, moderate, predictable, and equitably borne by all students in each segment

This statute will sunset on August 31, 1990, and the 1989-90 budget will be the last year covered by the policy unless the sunset date is removed or extended. During the five-year period covered by the policy, student fees have experienced the percentage measures shown on Display 1. The Governor's Budget proposes a 10 percent increase at the University and the State University, to raise student fees to $1,577 and $750, respectively. The budget also proposes a $3.6 augmentation at the University and $3.3 mil-

DISPLAY 1 Percentage Increase in Student Fees, 1985-86 Through 1989-90

	Percentage Increase	
	University of California	The California State University
1985-86	0.0%	0.0%
1986-87	0.0	0.0
1987-88	9.1	10.0
1988-89	4.4	8.6
1989-90 (proposed)	10.0	10.0

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

lion at the State University for additional financial assistance.

The Commission places a high priority on keeping fees as low as possible, with increases that are moderate, gradual, and predictable.

Recommendation: Commission staff should continue its work to extend the sunset date for the existing student fee policy, and work with the Department of Finance, the Legislative Analyst's Office, and the legislative budget committees to keep student fees as low as possible.

---

6. Funding capital outlay

The issue: As shown in Display 2 below, during the 12 years from 1976-77 through 1987-88, the State provided almost $1.67 billion dollars for capital construction, renovation, and repairs in the State's public postsecondary institutions. During the next 12 years, the postsecondary institutions project their need at more than four times that level -- at $7.68 billion.

A pent-up demand exists for new facilities and for renovations and repairs of existing ones. During the late 1970s and early '80s, fund sources usually reserved exclusively for capital outlay were shifted to the State's General Fund to support ongoing operations in other State programs. To deal with the combined effect of Proposition 13 and a severe economic recession, the State was forced to delay, defer, and cancel many priority higher education facilities projects.

The Governor's Budget proposes $188 million for the University's capital outlay program, $181.6 million for the State University's, and $111 million for the Community Colleges'. The budget also proposes $500,000 for the University to begin the planning and site selection process for proposed new campuses to accommodate increasing enrollment.

Enrollment increases projected for public postsecondary education in California through the next 20 years will require expansion of facilities in order to meet demand without sacrificing the quality or effectiveness of instruction. Certainly, technology will allow the State to relieve some of the enrollment pressures with new approaches, but the need for additional facilities to accommodate most students will remain. The Commission has initiated a planning process that will culminate in December 1989 with a set of recommendations on how the Governor and the Legislature should prepare to accommodate growth to the year 2005. This effort aims to frame a coherent and truly intersegmental plan for the State's educational needs in order to (1) estimate the long-term demand for enrollments throughout higher education, both public and private, (2) develop estimates of resource requirements to meet this demand, and (3) identify funding options with which the State could meet its commitment to accommodate eligible students.

Recommendation: Commission staff should continue its work in the area of long-range plan-

---

DISPLAY 2 Total State and Local Capital Outlay Expenditures (Excluding Federal and Non-State Funds) at the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges, 1976-77 to 1987-88, and Total Need Estimated by the Segments, 1988-89 to 1999-2000 (Dollars in Millions)

Year	University of California	The California State University	California Community Colleges	Total
Total Expenditures, 1976-77 to 1987-88	$ 813.1	$ 460.8	$382.0	$1,655.9
Total Need Estimated by the Segments, 1988-89 to 1999-2000	$3,600.0	$3,300.0	$780.0	$7,680.0

Source: Pickens, 1987.

---

ning, in addition to supporting adequate levels of capital outlay funding in the 1989-90 budget. Further, staff should work with segmental and State officials to develop a stable and secure funding source for future higher education capital outlay projects.

References

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Meeting California's Adult Education Needs: Recommendations to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language in the 1988 Budget Act.* Commission Report 88-35. Sacramento: The Commission, October 1988.

California Tomorrow. *Out of the Shadows -- The IRCA/SLIAG Opportunity: A Preliminary Needs Assessment on Educational Services for Eligible Legalized Aliens in California Under SLIAG.* San Francisco: California Tomorrow, December 26, 1988.

Pickens, William H. *The Infrastructure Needs of California Public Higher Education Through the Year 2000: A Presentation to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee on October 14, 1987.* Commission Report 87-39. Sacramento: The Commission, October 1987.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of January 1989, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Mim Andelson, Los Angeles
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach
Henry Der, San Francisco
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco
Helen Z. Hansen, Long Beach
Lowell J. Paige, El Macero, *Vice Chairperson*
Cruz Reynoso, Sacramento
Sharon N. Skog, Palo Alto, *Chairperson*
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Modesto

Representatives of the segments are:

Yori Wada, San Francisco; representing the Regents of the University of California

Claudia H. Hampton, Los Angeles; representing the Trustees of the California State University

John F. Parkhurst, Folsom; representing the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks; representing the Chairman of the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions

Kenneth L. Peters, Tarzana; representing the California State Board of Education

James B. Jamieson, San Luis Obispo; representing California's independent colleges and universities

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including Community Colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other state agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning.

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, the Commission's meetings are open to the public. Requests to address the Commission may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request prior to the start of a meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its executive director, Kenneth B. O'Brien, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission issues some 40 to 50 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education, and it makes these publications available without charge while supplies last.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514; telephone (916) 445-7933.

STATE BUDGET PRIORITIES OF THE COMMISSION, 1989

California Postsecondary Education Commission Report 89-7

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814-3985.

Recent reports of the Commission include:

88-40 The Fourth Segment: Accredited Independent Postsecondary Education in California. The Fifth in a Series of Reports on the Financial Condition of California's Regionally Accredited Independent Colleges and Universities (December 1988)

88-41 Beyond Assessment: Enhancing the Learning and Development of California's Changing Student Population. A Report in Response to the Higher Education Talent Development Act of 1987 (Assembly Bill 2016; Chapter 1296, Statutes of 1987) (December 1988)

88-42 The Role of the Commission in Achieving Educational Equity: A Declaration of Policy (December 1988)

88-43 Education Needs of California Firms for Trade in Pacific Rim Markets: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (December 1988)

88-44 Progress on the Development of a Policy for Revenue Collected by the California State University Through Concurrent Enrollment: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language to the 1988-89 Budget Act (December 1988)

88-45 Prepaid College Tuition and Savings Bond Programs: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (December 1988)

89-1 Legislative Priorities for the Commission, 1989: A Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (January 1989)

89-2 The Twentieth Campus: An Analysis of the California State University's Proposal to Establish a Full-Service Campus in the City of San Marcos in Northern San Diego County (January 1989)

89-3 Toward Educational Equity: Progress in Implementing the Goals of Assembly Concurrent Resolution 83 of 1984. A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 101 (Chapter 574, Statutes of 1987) (January 1989)

89-4 The Effectiveness of the Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement (MESA) Program's Administrative and Policy-Making Processes: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 610 (1985) (January 1989)

89-5 Comments on the Community Colleges' Study of Students with Learning Disabilities. A Report to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Report Language to the 1988 State Budget Act (January 1989)

89-6 Prospects for Postsecondary Enrollment to 2005: Report of the Executive Director to the California Postsecondary Education Commission, January 23, 1989 (January 1989)

89-7 State Budget Priorities of the Commission, 1989: A Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (March 1989)

89-8 Status Report on Human Corps Activities, 1989: The Second in a Series of Five Annual Reports to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 1820 (Chapter 1245, Statues of 1987) (March 1989)

89-9 A Further Review of the California State University's Contra Costa Center (March 1989)

89-10 Out of the Shadows -- The IRCA/SLIAG Opportunity: A Needs Assessment of Educational Services for Eligible Legalized Aliens in California Under the State Legalization Impact Assistance Grant Program of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, submitted to the California Postsecondary Education Commission, February 23, 1989, by California Tomorrow (March 1989)

89-11 Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1989-90: A Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) (March 1989)

89-12 Teacher Preparation Programs Offered by California's Public Universities: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language in the 1988 State Budget Act (March 1989)

89-13 The State's Reliance on Non-Governmental Accreditation: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 78 (Resolution Chapter 22, 1988) (March 1989)

89-14 Analysis of the 1989-90 Governor's Budget: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (March 1989)